

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE

Tel: (415) 554-7724
Fax: (415) 554-5163
TTD/TTY: (415) 554-5227



City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

March 25, 2025

President Rafael Mandelman and Members
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force 2024 Annual Report

Dear President Mandelman and Supervisors:

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (Task Force) submits the attached 2024 Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.30(c). The Report examines the processing and fulfillment of records requests by City departments and bodies, the Task Force's complaint resolution procedures and outcomes, and significant problems encountered in the Sunshine Ordinance's administration. It also offers recommendations for improving implementation and compliance with the Sunshine Ordinance.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this Report, please direct them to me or Task Force Administrator Patricia Petersen at (415) 554-7724 or by email to sotf@sfgov.org.

Best Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "M. Yankee".

Matt Yankee
Chair, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

c: Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Members
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Daniel Lurie, Mayor
Carmen Chu, City Administrator
David Chiu, City Attorney
Brooke Jenkins, District Attorney
Greg Wagner, Controller
Ethics Commission

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force 2024 Annual Report

Release Date: April 21, 2025

Authored by Laura Stein with Dean Schmidt. Issued on behalf of the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>San Francisco’s Public Records Requests and Responses.....</i>	<i>5</i>
Survey Process and Content.....	5
Number of Requests Received by City Bodies.....	7
Requests Fulfilled, Referred, and Redacted.....	8
Average Time to Fulfill Requests.....	8
Summary of Findings.....	9
<i>SOTF Complaint Resolution.....</i>	<i>9</i>
SOTF Complaint Hearings and Processing.....	11
Complaints Scheduled for SOTF Hearing in 2024.....	11
Number of Hearings Scheduled and Average Days to Hearing.....	13
SOTF Complaint Resolution Outcomes & Compliance.....	14
Summary of Complaint Resolution Findings.....	16
<i>Practical and Policy Problems.....</i>	<i>17</i>
Large “Retention Policy” Loophole to Evade San Francisco Transparency and Accountability Law (authored by Dean Schmidt).....	17
Record Retention/Destruction Policies Are Created Pursuant to California Law.....	18
The Law As Approved By San Francisco Voters Requires All Documents and Correspondence Be Maintained and Preserved.....	20
The Current Stance of the Mayor’s Office (Though Mayor Breed Has Recently Been Unseated) and City Attorney’s Office Proceeds As Though Section 67.29-7(a) Does Not Exist.....	21
It Is Not Possible to Reconcile City Department Refusal to Even Acknowledge Subsection 67.29-7(a)’s Broad Scope of Protection for Documents and Correspondence.....	22
<i>Conclusion and Recommendations.....</i>	<i>22</i>
References.....	24
Appendix A: Survey Text.....	26
Appendix B: City Bodies with Reported Data.....	27
Appendix C: Hearings Held in 2024.....	30
Appendix D: Average Days Between Petitions and Scheduled Hearing 2024.....	32
Appendix E: 2024 Task Force Members.....	34

Executive Summary

This report provides an overview of how San Francisco's Sunshine Ordinance operated in 2024. The report examines the processing and fulfillment of records requests by City bodies, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force's (SOTF) complaint resolution procedures and outcomes, and significant problems encountered in the law's administration. The report appraises stakeholders of San Francisco's Sunshine practices and problems and provides informed recommendations for improving implementation and compliance with the law.

Key findings:

- Survey results representing 49% of City bodies and NextRequest reporting indicated that the City received at least 15,462 records requests in 2024.
- The average time City bodies took to fulfill requests was 10 days according to the survey and 12 days according to NextRequest.
- The SOTF received 62 new complaints and resolved 73 complaints in 2024.
- 7 petitioners accounted for 52% of new complaints scheduled.
- The SOTF reduced its backlog of complaints from 94 to 21 over the 2024 year.
- The SOTF found violations in response to 32 complaints and did not find violations in response to 20 complaints. It found 47 Sunshine violations across all complaints, as some complaints involved multiple violations.
- Repeat petitioners brought 13 of the 20 complaints in which the Task Force found no violations.
- The SOTF took an average of 333 days to hear complaints, down from 407 days in 2023.
- The SOTF scheduled complaints for hearing an average of 2.2 times before resolution, down from 2.5 times in 2023.
- The SOTF increased the number of complaints processed annually and significantly reduced its complaint backlog.

SOTF recommendations:

- The SOTF should continue to reform its procedures to better meet the Sunshine Ordinance's 45-day mandate for complaint resolution.
- The Task Force should develop additional goals for the law's "practical and timely" implementation, including the goal of closely monitoring compliance.
- The Task Force should devote more time and resources to its policy-related duties.
- The City Attorney's Office should immediately revise its advice on records retention policies that exempt documents and correspondence that Section 67.29-7(a) of the Ordinance requires the City to maintain and preserve.
- The Board of Supervisors should encourage better tracking of records requests across all City bodies.

Introduction

This report provides an overview of how the Sunshine Ordinance operated in San Francisco City and County (the “City”) in 2024.

The report begins by examining the City’s reception and handling of records requests. We surveyed City bodies to gather information on the number of records requests received, the turnaround time for requests, and other key data on how requests were handled. We also examined a summary report generated by the online platform NextRequest, which facilitates the processing of records requests for many City bodies. This section of the report provides baseline data on the City’s processing of records requests during the calendar year.

The report next reviews complaint resolution procedures and outcomes for 2024. It looks at how the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) resolved petitioners’ complaints about alleged violations of the Sunshine Ordinance. We reviewed public documents produced by the SOTF to examine the timeliness, efficiency and outcomes of its complaint resolution processes. We also queried SOTF members and staff to gather data on compliance with SOTF orders for further action.

The report then addresses practical and policy problems encountered in administering the ordinance. Here we review problems and issues arising in 2024 that represent ongoing areas of concern. Along with analysis of these problems, we suggest potential solutions and paths forward.

We conclude by summarizing our findings and considering how the City and Task Force can further strengthen implementation and compliance with the Sunshine Ordinance in the future.

Background

As context for this report, we briefly discuss the purposes of the Sunshine Ordinance and the Task Force that oversees it.

The Sunshine Ordinance, embodied in Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, is designed to protect the public’s right to know about local government operations, actions and decisions (§ 67.1). The Ordinance outlines the public’s rights of access to government meetings and records, stipulates how City bodies are to provide such access, and creates an independent, citizen-led Task Force to oversee its implementation.

The Ordinance envisions a strong Task Force to oversee the law and “protect the public’s interest in open government” (§ 67.1(e)). It empowers the Task Force to resolve complaints over access to City information, records and meetings (§ 67.21(e)) and to help formulate open records and meetings policy (§ 67.30(c)).

Section 67.21(e) of the Sunshine Ordinance charges the Task Force with handling administrative appeals from petitioners whose records requests were denied. It calls on the Task Force to:

- Inform petitioners whether their requested records are public
- Order custodians of records to comply with public records requests
- Notify the district attorney or attorney general, who may act to ensure compliance with SOTF orders
- Conduct discretionary public hearings over records request denials

Under section 67.30(c), Task Force policy-related duties include:

- Advising the Board of Supervisors and City bodies on the law's implementation
- Developing goals to ensure the law's practical and timely implementation
- Proposing amendments to the law
- Reporting annually to the Board of Supervisors on problems encountered administering the law
- Reviewing and requesting reports on the law from the Supervisor of Public Records
- Making referrals regarding violations to those with enforcement power
- Reporting on compliance with other laws pertaining to public meetings and records

In sum, the law mandates that the SOTF ensure the public's right of access to public meetings and records, oversee implementation and compliance with the law, issue orders to City bodies violating the law, and advise City government on ongoing and future concerns affecting the law.

San Francisco's Public Records Requests and Responses

In order to better understand the City's Sunshine practices and activities, we sought basic data on public records requests and responses during the year. We obtained this information through a brief survey of City bodies, as well as a summary report from NextRequest. Some, though not all, City bodies use NextRequest to receive and/or process public records requests. Wherever possible, we used this report to corroborate and augment the data obtained in the survey.

Survey Process and Content

We surveyed City bodies that appeared to fall under the Sunshine Ordinance's jurisdiction. The Ordinance applies both to City "policy bodies" and "passive meeting bodies."

Under Section 67.3(d) of the Ordinance, policy bodies include:

- The Board of Supervisors (BoS)
- Bodies the Board of Supervisors creates by ordinance or resolution
- Bodies listed in the City Charter
- Bodies created by another policy body
- Bodies created by federal, state or local grant whose members are appointed by City officials, employees or agents

SOTF 2024 Annual Report

Under Section 67.3(c), passive meeting bodies include:

- Advisory committees created by policy bodies, the Mayor, or department heads
- Groups that discuss or advise the Mayor on fiscal, economic or policy issues
- Occasions to which a majority of members of a policy body are invited
- Bodies that review or make policy related to public health, safety, welfare and homelessness

Although no definitive list of City bodies exists, we used publicly available sources to identify bodies falling under the Ordinance's jurisdiction. The Office of the City Attorney, the SF.GOV website, and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco all publish lists of City bodies. We excluded bodies from our list when outside evidence showed that they were exempt from SOTF jurisdiction. We surveyed all remaining bodies.

A short, 10-question survey was sent out on Jan. 7, 2025. An introductory email, along with a link to the survey, was forwarded to one or more contact persons for each body. Although any person having custody of a public record qualifies as a custodian of records under the Ordinance (§ 67.21(a)), many bodies designate contact persons to oversee records requests. Surveys were sent to designated public records contacts, general contacts if no public records contact was given, or prior contacts known to the SOTF.

The survey contained questions on:

- The number of records requests received
- The number of requests fulfilled
- The number of requests referred to another body for fulfillment
- The number of requests requiring redactions of information
- The average number of days required to fulfill records requests

We instructed survey respondents to provide information for public records requests received during the previous calendar year and to leave blank any fields for which they did not have answers. Respondents were given 2 weeks to complete the survey. They were also asked for a screenshot of their NextRequest or GovQA dashboard displaying their records requests activities for the previous year. GovQA is an online platform that some law enforcement agencies use for processing records. The full text of the survey is reprinted in Appendix A.

The survey response rate for 2024 was as follows:

Number of City bodies queried in 2024: 138

Number of respondents: 68

Number of City bodies covered by the survey: 70

Survey response rate: 49%

We received 68 responses reporting on 70 City bodies. In a couple cases, one respondent submitted data for more than one body. Appendix B contains a complete list of respondents.

Number of Requests Received by City Bodies

City bodies were asked to report the number of records requests received in 2024. Because we received responses from a subset of City bodies, our survey indicates only a baseline number of requests received. The actual number of requests made was almost certainly much greater.

Survey respondents reported receiving about 10,785 requests in 2024. Nine City bodies with the greatest numbers of records requests appear in Table 1 below. These bodies received a total of 8,664 requests, or 80% of all requests reported.

City Bodies	2024 Records Requests
San Francisco Police Department - Legal Division	3,437
SF Municipal Transit Authority	1,100
Department of Public Works	1,095
Department of Building Inspection	851
SF Rent Board (RNT)	648
Airport	545
San Francisco Animal Care and Control	388
Department of Elections (REG)	300
District Attorney	300

Table 1: City Bodies with the Most Records Requests Reported 2024

Of the remaining 61 bodies reporting, 5 received between 100 and 300 requests, 18 received between 10 and 100, and 36 received 10 or fewer. Due to the wide variation among the number of records requests received, the mean and median averages also show a wide variance. The mean average number of requests reported for each body was 161, while the median was only 10.

In addition to the requests reported in the survey, a NextRequest performance report for San Francisco added another 4,772 requests to our accounting.

Total requests received on NextRequest by all City bodies on the platform: 7,776

Requests received on NextRequest by survey non-respondents: 4,772

Number of City bodies on NextRequest who did not respond to survey: 11

Total requests received according to NextRequest and survey data: 15,462

City bodies processed over 7,000 requests on NextRequest. Some of these were already included in our survey numbers. Excluding requests reported by City bodies who took our survey, we found an additional 4,772 requests. See Appendix B for a list of City bodies covered by the NextRequest report who did not appear in our survey. City bodies with the highest numbers of requests via NextRequest included the Fire Department with 889 requests, combined divisions of the Department of Public Health with 2,252, and combined divisions of the Public Utilities Commission with 982.

Taken together, our sources show the City received at least 15,462 records requests in 2024. However, our sources almost certainly undercount requests received for two reasons. First, many City bodies did not take the survey. Most notably, the SF Police Department, which accounted for 78% of records requests reported in 2023, neither responded to the survey nor shared its GovQA platform metrics. Second, because City bodies do not necessarily receive or record all their requests on NextRequest, the NextRequest summary report also likely underrepresents the total number of requests received.

Requests Fulfilled, Referred, and Redacted

The survey also asked respondents

- How often they were able to provide requested records
- How often they referred requesters to other bodies for fulfillment
- How often they redacted information when fulfilling records requests

Fulfilled requests: 7,113 (66%)

Referred requests: 516 (5%)

Fulfilled requests with redactions: 2,075 (19%)

These metrics aim to understand the work required to fulfill records requests. City bodies reported being able to provide requested information about 66% of the time and redacting information from records about 19% of the time. They infrequently referred requests to other bodies who might hold the information sought. We note, however, that unfulfilled or redacted requests do not necessarily indicate a failure to follow the law, since both the Sunshine Ordinance and the California Public Records Act list many conditions under which information and records may be withheld or redacted.

Average Time to Fulfill Requests

The survey also addressed the timeliness of information provision. It asked respondents for the average number of days it took to fulfill public records requests. Under the Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.21(b), administrative bodies must respond to records requests within 10 days, though exceptions exist for “voluminous” requests, records that are stored remotely, or requests that require consultations with other bodies (§ 67.25(b) & 67.25(d)).

Mean average days to fulfill a records request (survey): 10

Median average days to fulfill a records request (survey): 8

Average number of days to fulfill records requests (NextRequest): 12

Average initial response time in days (NextRequest): 3

While survey data suggested that most City bodies complied with the mandated response times, NextRequest data showed somewhat longer response times. According to NextRequest, most City bodies acknowledged records requests within 3 days but fulfilled them within 12. While 12 days is a longer time than the Ordinance allows, it does not necessarily indicate a failure to comply with the law, which permits City bodies to release responses to voluminous or complicated requests over an extended time period.

The NextRequest data suggests that some City bodies may have underestimated the time taken to process requests. NextRequest tracks response times once a petitioner or respondent enters the request into its system, making their numbers more reliable than those of City bodies, some of whom indicated that they do not track their requests and could only respond to our survey with estimations.

Summary of Findings

The City received at least 15,462 records requests in 2024. Many of these requests clustered around a handful of City bodies including the SFMTA, the Department of Public Works and the Department of Public Health. The number of requests received varied largely, with some bodies receiving hundreds and even thousands of requests and many others receiving few or no requests. The survey indicated that City bodies fulfilled records requests in requisite time, while NextRequest reporting showed longer response times.

Our data indicates a baseline number of public records requests received by the City, though it offers only a partial and imperfect accounting of the total number of requests received in 2024. We were not able to collect data for all City bodies, and we know little about bodies that did not take our survey or use NextRequest. Much of our data was self-reported, which may have biased or otherwise affected some of the answers given. In addition, some departments do not closely track their records request responses and could only estimate or approximate how many requests they received and how these were handled. Aside from NextRequest reporting, we were unable to triangulate or crosscheck the survey data through other sources.

SOTF Complaint Resolution

The Sunshine Ordinance offers a relatively quick, easy and inexpensive way to resolve conflicts over access to public information and meetings in the City. While California-wide laws direct people to the judicial system to defend their rights of access to the state's public records and meetings (CPRA § 6258 and The Ralph M. Brown Act § 54960.5), the Sunshine Ordinance establishes an independent Task Force to resolve complaints over access to City records. Whereas the judicial system imposes heavy burdens in terms of time, money and legal expertise, the Sunshine Ordinance offers petitioners an accessible, timely and cost-free way to challenge local decisions to deny access to records or meetings.

The Sunshine Task Force consists of 11 members, appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Members must have experience or demonstrated interest in citizen access or participation in local governance (§ 67.30(a)). The Task Force reviews complaints, conducts hearings if necessary, and makes determinations on whether the City has complied with the Ordinance. It issues orders documenting specific Sunshine violations and directing City bodies to release records or otherwise comply with the law.

Those denied access to public records or meetings may submit complaints directly to the SOTF. Petitioners submit a simple form in plain language indicating any alleged violations and provide documentation to support their claims. There is no charge for submitting a complaint.

The Ordinance establishes a timeframe in which the SOTF must resolve complaints:

The person making the request may petition the Sunshine Task Force for a determination whether the record requested is public. The Sunshine Task Force shall inform the petitioner, as soon as possible and within 2 days after its next meeting but in no case later than 45 days from when a petition in writing is received, of its determination whether the record requested, or any part of the record requested, is public... Upon the determination that the record is public, the Sunshine Task Force shall immediately order the custodian of the public record to comply with the person's request. (§ 67.21(e))

The Sunshine Ordinance envisions the Task Force making determinations and ordering compliance within 45 days of receiving complaints.

Hearings offer the Task Force a chance to hear from both petitioners and respondents, to ask questions, and to confer with each other about the merits of the complaint. While the Ordinance does not specify a resolution process, section 67.21(e) states that the SOTF may hold public hearings to help resolve complaints:

Where requested by the petition, the Sunshine Task Force may conduct a public hearing concerning the records request denial. An authorized representative of the custodian of the public records requested shall attend any hearing and explain the basis for its decision to withhold the records requested.

While the Sunshine Ordinance mandates that complaints be resolved within 45 days, the resolution process does not require that each complaint receive a hearing before the full Task Force.

The Ordinance stipulates that City bodies should comply with Task Force orders within 5 days. However, the Task Force has limited power to enforce compliance. The Ordinance directs the Task Force to refer compliance failures to legal officers of the City or State.

If the custodian refuses or fails to comply with any such order within 5 days, the Sunshine Task Force shall notify the district attorney or the attorney general who may take whatever measures she or he deems necessary to insure compliance with the ordinance (§ 67.21(e)).

The Ordinance also allows the Task Force to refer complaints involving willful failures to follow the law by City officials, department heads or managers to San Francisco's Ethics Commission. The Ethics Commission may then determine whether official misconduct took place (§ 67.34).

The SOTF follows a 2-step process for resolving complaints. Petitioners first appear before a committee that determines whether the requested records are public and whether the body

denying the request falls under the Ordinance's jurisdiction. This step constitutes a first hearing by committee. The committee also decides whether to send the complaint to the Task Force for a second hearing or for expedited review on a consent agenda. If the complaint is sent to the consent agenda, the full Task Force may adopt the committee's recommendations or remove the complaint from the agenda for a second hearing in the future. Currently, both petitioners and respondents are required to appear at full hearings.

Complaint hearings follow a quasi-judicial process in which the Task Force reviews all documents associated with the complaint, hears from both parties, and determines whether the City followed the law. The Task Force issues orders that may include instructions for the release of additional documents. In some cases, the Task Force directs the Compliance and Amendments Committee to monitor and report on compliance.

In April of 2024, the Task Force resolved to give priority handling to complaints involving the timely processing of records requests. As noted in our 2023 Annual Report, section 67.21 timeliness violations accounted for about half of all complaints made to the Task Force. Although it stopped short of giving its committees definitive decision-making power, the Task Force amended its bylaws to encourage them to make recommendations on how to resolve these complaints. It also encouraged committees to prioritize the scheduling of 67.21 complaints. Essentially, the Task Force greenlighted committees to send timeliness complaints, whenever possible, directly to its consent agenda with a clear recommendation for resolution. These revisions allowed the SOTF to schedule more complaints per meeting in 2024 and to resolve these complaints without a second full hearing. In 2023, 12 of the 49 complaints heard were consent agenda items. In 2024, this number rose to 20 of 73 complaints.

SOTF Complaint Hearings and Processing

Records requests laws, the Sunshine Ordinance included, presume that information has a shelf life. Once information can no longer inform a decision, a news story, or some other intended use, its utility to the requester attenuates or even expires. Sunshine Ordinance deadlines, such as prescribing a 10-day response time for requests, 45 days to determine appeals, or 5 days to comply with an order, reflect this reality. Although the Task Force has not always met its deadlines, the timely implementation of the law remains a primary goal.

This section of the report focuses on how the Task Force processed and decided complaints in 2024, with particular attention paid to the timeliness of the complaint process. We focus exclusively on complaints that were scheduled to be heard by the full Task Force, either on the regular or consent agenda, during the year. Our data sources included SOTF meeting agendas and minutes, staff notes, orders of determination, administrator reports, complaint petitions, and communication with SOTF members.

Complaints Scheduled for SOTF Hearing in 2024

This section provides information on the number and type of complaints scheduled for hearing during the year. It refers only to complaints scheduled before the full Task Force, not its committees.

SOTF 2024 Annual Report

SOTF meetings held in 2024: 11

Total complaints scheduled in 2024 (regular and consent agenda hearings): 73

Complaints scheduled for resolution by hearing: 48

Complaints scheduled for resolution by consent agenda: 20

Reconsideration requests of previous complaint resolutions: 2

Compliance hearings for previous complaint resolutions: 7

Complaints constituting immediate disclosure requests (IDRs): 20

Seventy-three complaints were scheduled for hearing over eleven SOTF meetings. Complaints scheduled for resolution were either brought before the Task Force for a full hearing or for expedited review on the consent agenda. Forty-eight complaints were scheduled for a regular hearing, which if held, would lead to the issuance of an order of determination. Twenty complaints were placed on a consent agenda, which could result in the adoption of a committee's recommendation or in the complaint's removal from the consent agenda for hearing on a future date. Some complaints were scheduled as requests for reconsideration of earlier determinations or for compliance reviews of prior Task Force orders. Twenty complaints scheduled in 2024 involved immediate disclosure requests, which require respondents to reply to requests in just 1 day, rather than the usual 10 days allowed for regular requests.

Some petitioners and respondents appeared before the Task Force on multiple occasions, requiring more time and resources than others.

Petitioners filing 3 or more complaints: 7

Complaints brought by repeat petitioners: 38 (52%)

City bodies receiving 3 or more complaint: 8

Breakdown of city bodies receiving 3 or more complaints:

San Francisco Police Department: 14

San Francisco Municipal Transit Authority: 8

Mayor's Office: 4

Fine Arts Museum: 3

Department of Emergency Management: 3

Planning Department: 3

City Attorney's Office: 3

The SOTF does not limit the number of complaints a petitioner can submit each year. In 2024, 7 petitioners accounted for over half of the 73 complaints brought before the Task Force. A single petitioner may file multiple justified complaints. However, in cases where petitioners repeatedly allege violations that the Task Force does not confirm, these complaints may monopolize SOTF time and resources and delay the hearings of other petitioners. In addition, some City bodies received multiple complaints against them, which may indicate broader compliance problems within these bodies. However, multiple alleged violations do not necessarily signal ongoing compliance problems, since the SOTF may not confirm violations in all cases or the complaints might be a very small subset of the overall number of records requests received.

SOTF 2024 Annual Report

Number of Hearings Scheduled and Average Days to Hearing

Total SOTF hearings scheduled: 91
SOTF hearings held: 83
SOTF hearings continued: 8
Education, Outreach and Training Committee hearings held: 10
Complaints Committee hearings held: 58
Compliance and Amendments Committee hearings held: 6
Total committee hearings held: 74
Total combined hearings scheduled for SOTF and committees: 157
Mean average number of hearings scheduled: 2.15 (157/73)

In total, the SOTF scheduled 91 hearings for the 73 complaints processed, including new complaints, compliance hearings and requests for reconsideration. Hearings were continued on 8 occasions, and 83 hearings were held for all complaints. In addition, 74 complaints were heard first in committees, who considered whether to send the complaint to the SOTF as a regular hearing or consent agenda item. The Complaint Committee heard the bulk of new complaints. Appendix C shows the total number of hearings held across both the full Task Force and its committees.

Mean average days between complaint filing and hearing: 333
Median average days between complaint filing and hearing: 337
Mean average days between request for reconsideration and hearing: 38 (2 complaints)
Complaints scheduled for hearing within 45-days: 1
Complaints scheduled for hearing within 100 days: 17 (25%)

Most petitioners waited around 11 months for their complaint to be heard, with the mean and median average time to hearing and resolution being upwards of 333 days. Requests for reconsideration of previous rulings were processed more quickly, with an average turnaround time of 38 days. Although only one complaint met the 45-day mandate for resolution, 17 complaints were processed within 100 days. Many of these complaints were heard later in the year, once the SOTF began to expedite the processing of 67.21 complaints.

Complaints pending before the SOTF at beginning of year: 94
Complaints pending before the SOTF at the year's end: 21
New complaints filed during 2024: 62
Ratio of complaints received to complaints scheduled during 2024: 62/73
Percentage of records requests represented by new complaints: 62/15,462 (.004%)

At the beginning of 2024, the SOTF had a backlog of 94 complaints. By year's end, only 21 complaints remained. SOTF efforts to close complaints where petitioners were non-responsive to scheduling requests, as well as the processing of a greater number of complaints during the year, significantly reduced the number of complaints pending. In addition, while the SOTF received more than 100 new complaints in 2022 and 2023, 2024 saw only 62 new complaints filed.



Chart 1: New Complaints by Year 2024

For the past several years, the SOTF received more complaints than it could schedule annually, ensuring a continuous backlog. Under current procedures, the SOTF can process a greater number of complaints per year, resolve complaints more efficiently, and eliminate its backlog within the coming year.

SOTF Complaint Resolution Outcomes & Compliance

The Sunshine Ordinance allows the Task Force to hold hearings on complaints and to determine whether City bodies should release requested public records. In this section, we look at the outcomes of complaint hearings, with particular attention paid to which violations the Task Force found, whether SOTF rulings confirmed violations alleged by petitioners, and whether City bodies complied with Task Force orders. We recognize that whether the Task Force confirmed alleged violations is an imperfect measure of how well the SOTF protected petitioner rights, since not all alleged violations constitute actual violations under the law.

Total alleged violations: 125

Most common alleged violations:

67.21 failing to respond to a records request in complete/timely manner: 39 (31%)

67.25 failing to respond to an immediate disclosure request in complete/timely manner: 19 (15%)

Total alleged timeliness violations: 58 (46%)

Petitioners alleged 125 violations over a total of 73 complaints. The most common alleged violations charged that City bodies had not supplied records in a complete or timely manner. Fifteen percent of the alleged violations concerned immediate disclosure requests, which require City bodies to respond within one day of receiving the request.

Total violations found: 47

Ratio of violations found to violations alleged: 47/125 (38%)

Most common violations found:

67.21 failing to respond to a records request in complete/timely manner: 13

SOTF 2024 Annual Report

67.21b, failing to comply with a request for public information: 7

Total 67.21 violations found: 23 (49%)

By far the most common violations found were related to timeliness. Table 2 shows all violations found by the SOTF.

Section	# Found	Description
67.21	13	failing to respond to a public records request in a complete or timely manner
67.21b	7	failing to comply with request for public information
67.27	3	withholding records without justification
67.29-7	3	failing to maintain and preserve public records in a professional and businesslike manner
67.21e	2	failing to respond to records request in a complete or timely manner
67.26	2	failing to keep withholding to a minimum and not properly identifying redactions
67.34	2	willfully violating SOTF orders
67.29-5	2	failing to respond to Prop G calendar request in timely manner
67.5b	1	failing to conduct meetings of any policy body open and public
67.7-1(c)	1	failing to properly notice meetings and provide information discussed at meeting
67.7(a)	1	failing to notice meeting within 72 hours & to post an agenda with meaningful descriptions in a timely manner
67.7(d)	1	acting on an item that does not appear in the posted meeting agenda
67.10b	1	taking action by secret ballot
67.11	1	failing to properly notice a closed session hearing
67.16	1	failing to provide minutes within 10 days of meeting
67.21c	1	failing to assist the complainant in refining their search for public records & comply in timely manner
67.25	1	failing to respond to an IDR in a timely manner
67.28	1	charging a member of the public for a public record
67.25a	1	failing to respond to an IDR in a timely manner
CPRA		failure to provide a determination of disclosable public records
6253	1	within 10 days
54953(c)	1	failing to cite a statutory authority for withholding records
47		

Table 2: Violations Found by SOTF 2024

Overall, the number of violations found in 2024 was only 38% of those alleged. In 2023, the Task Force confirmed 59% of alleged violations; in 2022, they confirmed 88%.

We saw earlier that 7 petitioners, filing 3 or more complaints, accounted for just over half of all complaints heard by the SOTF in 2024. The outcomes of these complaints were as follows:

SOTF 2024 Annual Report

Repeat petitioner complaints closed without a determination: 6/38 (16%)

Total repeat petitioner complaints in which no violation was found- 13/38 (34%)

Total repeat petitioner complaints with no violation or closed: 19/38 (50%)

In just over a third of these complaints, the SOTF found no violations. In other cases, the petitioners decided to drop the complaint before a determination was made. In over half these complaints, repeat petitioners either closed the complaint after it was scheduled or no violation was found.

While many petitioners alleged more violations than the SOTF ultimately found, the Task Force did confirm one or more alleged violations in most cases.

Complaints in which at least 1 violation was found: 32

Complaints in which “no violation” was found: 20

Complaints in which SOTF confirmed alleged violations: 32/52, or 61%

Complaints submitted by repeat petitioners in which “no violation” was found: 13/20 (65%)

Complaints receiving no ruling, i.e. withdrawn, tabled, dismissed or continued: 15

The Task force confirmed alleged violations in 32 complaint cases and did not confirm them in 20, 13 of which were brought by repeat petitioners. Overall, the SOTF confirmed one or more alleged violations in 61% of complaints coming before the Task Force for the first time. By comparison, in 2022, the SOTF confirmed one or more alleged violations in 75% of complaints in 2022 and 64% in 2023. An additional 15 cases received no ruling because they were dropped or dismissed after being scheduled.

While the Task Force can find City bodies in violation of the Ordinance and order them to release records, it has limited powers to ensure compliance with its orders. In 2023, the Task Force issued 53 orders to resolve complaints. Many of these orders included directions to the Task Force administrator or one of its committees to monitor compliance.

Number of orders issued: 53

Number of orders with directions to monitor compliance: 21

Number of orders with confirmed compliance: 6

Number of orders with no confirmed compliance: 15

Complaints referred to Ethics Commission- 2

Twenty-one orders included directives to confirm that petitioners had received requested documents or that respondents had released them, to help both parties refine the request, to review submitted documents, or to otherwise ensure compliance with their orders. To date, the Task Force has only confirmed compliance with 6 orders issued in 2024. It also sent 2 complaints to the Ethics Commission for further review and possible enforcement action.

Summary of Complaint Resolution Findings

The Ordinance charges the Task Force with developing goals to ensure the law’s practical and timely implementation and mandates the resolution of complaints within 45 days. In recent

years, the Task Force has made several procedural changes designed to better meet those goals. Most notably, the Task Force has begun to use a consent agenda to expedite the processing of complaints alleging 67.21 timeliness violations. This report suggests that the SOTF is making progress on processing cases in a timely and efficient manner.

In 2024, the SOTF scheduled 73 complaints for hearing, compared to 49 in 2023 and 55 in 2022. Each complaint was scheduled an average of 2.2 times before it was resolved. Complaints on the consent agenda were reviewed and resolved without a second full hearing, unlike those on the regular agenda. The average time between filing a complaint and receiving a hearing dropped from 407 days in 2023 to 333 days in 2024. Later in the year, when committees prioritized timeliness complaints for faster resolution, many complaints were resolved in under 100 days. Changes to SOTF procedures resulted in the processing of more complaints and a significantly reduced backlog by year's end. With only 62 new complaints filed in 2024, the SOTF is on track to eliminate its backlog in 2025.

The Task Force continues to act as a strong proponent for Sunshine rights, supporting petitioners in 61% of their complaint resolution orders. It has been less effective in ensuring compliance with their orders, though its powers to do so are limited. Twenty-one of its orders contained directives to confirm compliance. The Task Force confirmed compliance in 6 cases. Seven cases are slated to be scheduled in upcoming meetings, and some were referred back to the full Task Force for further deliberation. The status of others is to be determined. While 2 complaints were sent to the Ethics Commission, further action on these cases remains at the Ethics Commission's discretion.

Practical and Policy Problems

The Sunshine Ordinance directs the Task Force to alert the Board of Supervisors to practical and policy problems associated with administering the Ordinance during the year. The Task Force as a body has endorsed all items included in this section. Items not endorsed by the full Task Force, but which one or more members wanted to bring to the Board of Supervisors' attention, appear in *Appendix X*.

Large “Retention Policy” Loophole to Evade San Francisco Transparency and Accountability Law (authored by Dean Schmidt)

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force has recently been confronting a troublesome discrepancy between public records disclosure laws, on the one hand, like the California Public Records Act {“CPRA”} and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, and on the other, regarding “retention policies” being relied upon to mask practices of immediate deletion or destruction of public official communications or other written materials.

In two complaints involving the Mayor of San Francisco and the City Attorney's office (SOTF Complaint files #24042 and #24046), valid public records requests were reviewed that sought production of text messages sent using personal devices (i.e. cell phones). In the complaint against the Mayor, the request was for a single “most recent” text involving city business, to

anyone. The Mayor responded not by producing a responsive recent text, but instead by denying that such a text existed. The Mayor's office asserted that such texts were considered to be delete-able since the Mayor's office maintained a written retention policy that permitted prompt and immediate deletion (zero retention period) for specified categories of communications that the office deems do not qualify as public records, and upon deletion, production would obviously no longer be possible.

The Mayor was also asked to produce her most recent "Signal chat, Microsoft Teams message, Telegram message, and WhatsApp message." These are just some of the many electronic channels of communication that a public official could use on a personal device. All of these communications platforms are generally within the scope of public access under the CPRA where public business is discussed. These are writings that, though kept in personal accounts, are obtainable public records when they "relate in some substantive way to the conduct of the public's business" (*City of San Jose v. Superior Court of Santa Clara County*, 21 Cal.4th 608, 618 (2017)). The California Supreme Court confirmed this "broad" standard in 2017, specifically leaving out only communications "that are primarily personal, containing no more than incidental mentions of agency business." Id.

Considering how much public business is now, as of 2025, conducted over these platforms, the question here is an important one: Can records retention allowances be used to universally eliminate the public's access to correspondence and communications sent to and from a public official's cellphone? The answer may generally look to California state law, but in San Francisco the answer might reside in the Sunshine Ordinance passed by voters in 1999.

Record Retention/Destruction Policies Are Created Pursuant to California Law

Public agencies like the City and County of San Francisco have legal authority under state law to draw up their own record retention policies as specified in California Government Code section 34090:

"Unless otherwise provided by law, with the approval of the legislative body by resolution and the written consent of the city attorney, the head of a city department may destroy any city record, document, book, or paper, under the department head's charge, without making a copy thereof, after the same is no longer required. This section does not authorize the destruction of: (a) Records affecting the title to real property or liens thereon.; (b) Court records.; (c) Records required to be kept by statute.; (d) Records less than two years old.; (e) The minutes, ordinances, or resolutions of the legislative body or of a city board or commission. This section shall not be construed as limiting or qualifying in any manner the authority provided in Section 34090.5 for the destruction of records, documents, instruments, books, and papers in accordance with the procedure therein prescribed."

In essence, cities throughout California by virtue of this one statute are given broad authorization to destroy anything written that is not a "record," when "no longer required" (whatever that

means). However, section 34090 authorization contains an important caveat -- the provision explicitly applies “[u]nless otherwise provided by law.”

Local agencies are choosing to use a much narrower definition of “records” for purposes of retention/destruction limitations, enabling them to destroy much more. Courts have found that the CPRA does not purport to govern record destruction: “[The] Act itself does not undertake to prescribe what type of information a public agency may gather, nor to designate the type of records such an agency may keep, nor to provide a method of correcting such records. Its sole function is to provide for disclosure” (*Los Angeles Police Department v. Superior Court*, 65 Cal.App.3d. 661, 668 (1977)). At the state law level, at least, the term “records” in Government Code section 34090 has been construed instead to only include the same material as Penal Code sections 6200 and 6201, which impose criminal penalties for destruction of public records. A 1981 opinion from the California Attorney General applied the criminal standard to decide whether a tape recording of a city council meeting to facilitate preparation of the minutes could be destroyed at any time. The Attorney General analyzed a line of cases about the limited scope of materials considered to be “records” and thus protected under sections 6200/6201. The opinion concluded that the protections for a “record” only apply if the material is “kept either (1) because a law requires it to be kept or (2) because it is necessary or convenient to the discharge of the public officer’s duties and was made or retained for the purpose of preserving its informational content for further reference” (64 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 317 (Cal. A.G. 1981)). The Attorney General concluded that if the sole purpose of the tape recording was in fact to facilitate preparation of the minutes, it does not qualify, but if there is a dual purpose such as to preserve the informational content, it will be considered legally a record. Id.

In San Francisco, for any item that meets that narrow “record” definition, the shortest possible period of preservation is five years. San Francisco Administrative Code sec. 8.3. Retention is limited to “records,” however, a term which is narrowly defined at 8.1 as materials that “may have been retained by [a] department as evidence of the department’s activities, for the information contained therein, or to protect the legal or financial rights of the City and County.” This looks a lot like the state law definition of “records.” Significantly, section 8.3 concludes with the proviso: “Nothing in this Section shall be deemed to apply to or authorize the destruction of any records that are required to be retained by local, state or federal law.”

The policies that the San Francisco Mayor’s and City Attorney’s offices have devised focus, accordingly, on a limited definition of “records” for retention purposes, permitting destruction of conceivably 80-90% of documents that would come within the coverage of the CPRA. The Mayor’s 2014 policy, for example, basically permits immediate destruction of anything that is, according to the office, not a “record” when “no longer needed.” Though the Mayor’s policy explicitly acknowledges that the scope of destruction must still “comply with contractual or legal requirements,” it makes no mention of one significant legal requirement — Administrative Code section 67.29-7(a), a San Francisco law passed by voters in 1999 contained as part of the Sunshine Ordinance.

The narrow category of records protected from immediate destruction under the state statute contrasts sharply with the broad definition of materials encompassed at Administrative Code section 67.29-7(a).

The Law As Approved By San Francisco Voters Requires All Documents and Correspondence Be Maintained and Preserved

The state section 34090 authorization purports to require retention periods, but only for a fairly narrow group identified as “records.” This contrasts sharply with the breadth of coverage in the California Public Records Act (CPRA). The CPRA (Cal. Gov’t Code § 7920.545) provides public access to writings generally, defined as “any handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing, transmitting by electronic mail or facsimile, and every other means of recording upon any tangible thing any form of communication or representation, including letters, words, pictures, sounds, or symbols, or combinations thereof.” The Supreme Court in *City of San Jose* discussed specifically the inclusion of “[e]mail, text messaging, and other platforms,” taking note of the “ease and immediacy of electronic communication” using personal devices. *Id.* at 618.

Voters in 1999 passed into law the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, a “local law” which includes the provision regarding record preservation enumerated at Administrative Code section 67.29-7(a): “The Mayor and all Department Heads shall maintain and preserve in a professional and businesslike manner all documents and correspondence, including but not limited to letters, e-mails, drafts, memorandum, invoices, reports and proposals and shall disclose all such records in accordance with this [Sunshine] ordinance.” It seems safe to say the variety here of “records” correlates to the broad coverage of the CPRA, not to section 34090.

California state law (Government Code § 7922.505) expressly authorizes local enhancements to state public records laws: “Except as otherwise prohibited by law, a state or local agency may adopt requirements for itself that allow for faster, more efficient, or greater access to records than prescribed by the minimum standards set forth in this division.” The California Constitution (Article I, § 3(b)(2)) mandates that a law be broadly construed if it “furthers the people’s right of access.”

The meaning of maintain and preserve should be fairly clear, but if there were ambiguity one could look to the actual language the voters considered in enacting the measure in 1999. The California Supreme Court directs us to look at legislative history to discern the meaning of uncertain statutory language. For voter initiative statutes, courts will “interrogate the electorate’s purpose, as indicated in the ballot arguments and elsewhere” (*Hodges v. Superior Court*, 21 Cal.4th 109, 114 (1999)). This may include looking at statements of legislative analysis or purpose, or pro and con ballot arguments in the ballot pamphlet.

Within the Voter Information Pamphlet for the Nov. 2, 1999 City and County election, the Digest for Proposition G, including what would become section 67.29-7(a), informed voters that under this law “[t]he City would be required to ...maintain certain records for longer periods.” In his official statement for inclusion in the pamphlet, the City Controller warned voters that the change to the law would require, at a minimum, “additional staffing and computer hardware and software that is likely to cost” over \$400,000 annually, due to “requirements for retaining more documents for longer periods of time than would be normal.” (Voter Information Pamphlet for 11-2-99 San Francisco Election, p. 119.) Whether we call it preservation, maintenance, or

retention, there is clearly no rationale for the kind of systematic immediate deletion currently being practiced within the San Francisco government.

The Current Stance of the Mayor's Office (Though Mayor Breed Has Recently Been Unseated) and City Attorney's Office Proceeds As Though Section 67.29-7(a) Does Not Exist

In the recent Task Force proceedings, the Mayor's production of zero texts, when asked to produce only the most recent existing text, can have only one meaning – that every responsive text going back to when the cell phone was first put into use (the Mayor, like other City Hall personnel, uses only a personal phone to communicate by phone, text or other services) has been deleted. Ergo, at the precise moment the response was made, all texts, including “the most recent,” had either been “auto-deleted” or deleted by personnel in the Mayor's office. The only rational explanation is the Mayor and her office believe they have no obligation to maintain and preserve those written public communications for any amount of time, and that is exactly what the Mayor's Office asserts now – that they were entitled to ignore the Sunshine mandate due to their own retention policy that they claim complies with state law. But the state law that authorizes local agencies to draft retention policies never said that County or City law could simply be overridden and documents otherwise specifically subject to preservation by law can be immediately destroyed, deleted or shredded. The law of the State of California authorizing document destruction/retention policies (Cal. Gov't. Code § 34090) in fact explicitly states that those policies are limited by all laws.

Certainly, the Mayor cannot claim lack of personal knowledge/involvement. As owner, possessor and daily user of the cell phone/device whereby she communicates by text (or email or other services), she personally would be either the author or recipient of all such texts. It is the Mayor herself, not one of her subordinates, who writes her texts, hits send, receives alerts when a text is received, and reads them with her own eyes.

The Mayor's Office may or may not have gotten this idea from the City Attorney. Likely, that did happen. The City Attorney's Office distributes throughout City departments a document labelled *The Good Government Guide*. The Guide purports to provide a “helpful general reference” to navigate practical and legal issues. The Guide is not legal advice, as it specifically states, but is instead a “resource” – an “overview” (Good Government Guide, 2024, pp. 1-2). Nevertheless, City staff frequently consult that Guide and often rely on it.

The Guide includes a 4-page section titled “Record retention and destruction laws” (Good Government Guide, 2024, p. 135). The City Attorney mentions section 67.29-7(a) a single time, in essence denying 29.7(a) has any effect on document preservation: “This does not mean that a department must retain all its records. Rather, institution of and compliance with the department's records retention policy satisfies this provision” (Good Government Guide, 2024, p. 138). No authority is provided (and most likely none exists) for the assertion that compliance with a department's own policy satisfies the legal duty to comply with this provision of the law in the City and County of San Francisco. Furthermore, this language fails to account for the mayor's own retention policy acknowledgement that writings not qualifying as records “need not be retained unless retention is otherwise specified by local law.”

Basically, the City Attorney's Office may have gotten it backwards. They seem to think the departmental policy, if "approved" by a City Attorney signature, could trump the local law, but that is not how the law works. As set forth above, at both the state and local level, any authority for destruction includes a specific provision deferring to all local laws. Treating 67.29-7(a) as essentially being swallowed up by records retention provisions is contrary to the entire scheme set forth in California and San Francisco law. The City Attorney even seems to boast of the practical effect of this omission in their Guide, noting, significantly, "The vast majority of public records in the City's possession do not fall under the definition of "records" within the meaning of records retention law. Therefore, the City may destroy these records at any time." (Good Government Guide, 2024, p. 136).

A separate Sunshine provision, section 67.29-1, requires that documents prepared, received or maintained by the Mayor and other department heads are the property of the City and that originals must be kept consistent with record retention policies. That provision was included in the 1999 Proposition G along with section 67.29.7(a) and voters approved them together. Section 67.29-1 explicitly conditions its requirements on the limits posed by record retention policies. Section 67.29-7(a) could have included that same limitation, obviously, but it does not. Section 67.29.7(a) explicitly does not defer to retention policies nor to any other law.

It Is Not Possible to Reconcile City Department Refusal to Even Acknowledge Subsection 67.29-7(a)'s Broad Scope of Protection for Documents and Correspondence

The one actual authority that permits destruction is section 34090, and that is where the City places its reliance. But if you choose to rely on 34090 you also must be bound by its exceptions for local laws. In sum, it goes like this: With specified narrow exceptions for certain "records," 34090 permits destruction. In San Francisco, section 34090 destruction can only occur if it is not disallowed by 67.29-7(a). 67.29-7(a) relies on the broad CPRA definition of public records, and mandates preservation of not only records but specifically "documents and correspondence ... " The current belief exhibited by City departments that 67.29-7(a) is governed by or "satisfied by" departmental retention policies is simply incorrect. The correct way to undergo document destruction in San Francisco would be to allow section 34090 destruction only if a broad reading of 67.29-7(a) allows it, which it does not.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Procedural changes undertaken in this and recent years have enabled the SOTF to come closer to its mandate to resolve complaints within 45 days. In 2024, the SOTF processed more complaints in a shorter timeframe than in 2022 or 2023. In prior years, the SOTF received more complaints that it could process annually. At present, the SOTF is close to eliminating its backlog and has adjusted its procedures to better handle the volume of cases it typically receives. However, the Task Force has yet to meet the timeliness requirements of the Ordinance.

In addition to the 45-day mandate, the Task Force should formulate more explicit goals around the law's "practical and timely" implementation. Explicit goals would offer additional direction to future procedural reforms. Such goals might include developing processes for identifying

complaints that petitioners do not plan to pursue prior to scheduling them, creating guidelines for the City around immediate disclosure requests which often engender complaints, and developing protocols to prevent repeat petitioners from monopolizing the Task Force's time and resources. The Task Force could also take on the goal of improving its monitoring of compliance. While it may lack enforcement powers under the law, compliance monitoring provides a watchdog function that may help more petitioners get the information and documents they seek.

Resolving complaints more quickly and practically would also allow the Task Force to devote more time and resources to its policy-related duties. These might include advising the City on the law's implementation, giving input on the City's Sunshine training, educating the public on the law and its uses, and proposing amendments to clarify gray areas in the law. The Task Force could also spend more time researching and devising solutions to evolving problems related to the law's implementation, such as the growing use of retention policies to circumvent the law or the problematic status of public-private partnerships under the law.

Finally, while we know about problems with the law based on the complaints we receive, these represent less than .004% of records requests made. Moreover, the Ordinance does not require City bodies to track or report the requests they handle. As such, it is difficult to know whether most City bodies are meeting the requirements of the law. We continue to recommend, as we did in our 2022 Annual Report, that City bodies have a systematic means of tracking their handling of records requests, whether through NextRequest or internal procedures. At a minimum, City bodies should track the number of records requests received, their processing times, and their fulfillment status. Future iterations of the Sunshine Ordinance could also establish some minimal reporting requirements to help the City better evaluate administration and compliance with the law.

References

64 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 317 (Cal.A.G.), 1981 WL 126747.

Boards and Commissions, San Francisco, CA. Last Accessed Feb 20, 2025 at <https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/boards/w/098a146c082ae14e>.

Cal Gov't Code 34090 (pertaining to public records retention policy). Last Accessed on Feb 20, 2025 at:
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV§ionNum=34090.

California Constitution, Last accessed Feb. 21, 2025 at:
<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codesTOCSelected.xhtml?tocCode=CONS&tocTitle=+California+Constitution+-+CONS>

California Public Records Act, Cal Gov't Code § 7920.000-7931.000 (2024) (formerly 6250-6270). Access to Public Records. Last Accessed February 20, 2025 at:
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV§ionNum=7920.000

Chiu, David and Office of the City Attorney. List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charger, Ordinance or Statute (last updated Nov. 19, 2024). San Francisco, CA. Last Accessed Jan 20, 2025 at
<https://www.sfcityattorney.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/Memo-re-Boards-and-Commissions-November-2024.pdf>

Chiu, David, City Attorney of San Francisco. (2024). Good Government Guide: An Overview of the Laws Governing the Conduct of Public Officials. Last Accessed February 20, 2025 at:
<https://www.sfcityattorney.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/2024-Good-Government-Guide.pdf>

City of San Jose v. Superior Court of Santa Clara County, 21 Cal.4th 608, 618 (2017).

Hodges v. Superior Court, 21 Cal.4th 109 (1999).

Los Angeles Police Department v. Superior Court, 65 Cal.App.3d 661 (1977).

Ralph M. Brown Act, Cal Gov't Code 54950-54963 (2024) (pertaining to Meetings). Last Accessed on Feb 20, 2025 at:
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&division=2.&title=5.&part=1.&chapter=9.&article=

SOTF 2024 Annual Report

San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance of 1999. (SF Admin. Code Ch. 67). Last Accessed on Feb 20, 2025 at: https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_admin/0-0-0-19477

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot, Consolidated Municipal Elections, November, 2, 1999. Prepared by the Department of Elections, City and County of San Francisco. Last Access Feb. 21, 2025 at: https://digitalsf.org/islandora/object/islandora%3A218003?solr_nav%5Bid%5D=76d3c9465c917140022e&solr_nav%5Bpage%5D=0&solr_nav%5Boffset%5D=0.

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 2024, Complaint file #24042.

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 2024, Complaint file #24046.

Appendix A: Survey Text

SOTF Department Survey - 2024

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) requests that you provide information on the public records requests received and processed by your administrative body during the 2024 calendar year. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability and submit your response by January 21, 2025. If your body does not collect information that would enable you to answer a question, you may leave that question blank. The data you provide is public and subject to the terms & conditions stated on the survey platform. The SOTF will use your answers to create an overview of San Francisco Sunshine activity in 2024. If you have any questions, please email Laura Stein, SOTF Vice-Chair and Survey Administrator, at Lstein.sotf@gmail.com. We request that in addition to taking the survey, those using NextRequest or GovQA generate a summary report covering the period 1/1/2024-12/31/2024 through either system and email it to Lstein.sotf@gmail.com.

- What is your name?
- What is your email address?
- For which department, agency, commission, or body are you answering this survey? (Please name them all.)
- In 2024, how many public records requests did your department, agency, commission, or body receive?
- In 2024, how many public records requests were submitted to your department, agency, commission, or body on NextRequest or GovQA? (For those using NextRequest, please submit a NextRequest summary report for the period 1/1/2024 through 12/31/2024.)
- In 2024, for how many public records requests was your department, agency, commission, or body able to provide the requested information?
- In 2024, for how many public records requests did you refer the requester to another department, agency, commission, or body for the information sought?
- In 2024, for how many public records requests did you redact information in your response?
- What was the mean average time (in days) it took your body to fulfill a public records request in 2024? (Mean Average Time = Total Days Spent ÷ Number of Requests)
- What was the median average time (in days) it took your body to fulfill a public records request in 2024? (Median Average Time: Arrange all data points from smallest to largest; and pick the one in the middle. If there are two middle values, take the mean of those two numbers.)

Appendix B: City Bodies with Reported Data

Survey Respondents

1. ADM (City Administrator) - Office of the County Clerk
2. ADM (City Administrator) Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs and the Immigrant Rights Commission
3. ADM (City Administrator)- Office of Cannabis
4. ADM-COIT (Committee on Information Technology)
5. Airport
6. Asian Art Museum
7. Assessment Appeals Board
8. Assessor-Recorder
9. Behavioral Health Commission
10. Building Inspection
11. Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee
12. Civil Service Commission
13. Controller's Office
14. Convention Facilities Department
15. Department of Child Support Services
16. Department of Early Childhood
17. Department of Elections (REG)
18. Department of Emergency Management (all divisions EXCEPT 911 Dispatch)
19. Department of Police Accountability
20. Department on the Status of Women
21. Department of Human Resources
22. District Attorney
23. ECN/Office of Economic & Workforce Development, Film SF
24. Election Commission
25. Entertainment Commission
26. ENV (SF Environment Department)
27. Ethics Commission
28. Film SF
29. Fine Arts Museums
30. Fire Commission
31. Food Security Task Force
32. Housing Authority
33. Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board
34. Juvenile Probation Department
35. Library

36. Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
37. Office of Contract Administration
38. Office of Labor Standards Enforcement
39. Office of Small Business
40. Office of the City Administrator - Central Office
41. Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee
42. Police Commission
43. Port of San Francisco
44. Public Works
45. Recreation and Park Department
46. Retirement
47. San Francisco Animal Care and Control
48. San Francisco Animal Commission - Commission of Animal Control and Welfare
49. San Francisco City Attorney's Office
50. San Francisco County Transportation Authority
51. San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and their Families; the Children and Youth Fund Oversight & Advisory Committee; and the Free City College Oversight and Advisory Committee
52. San Francisco Health Authority dba San Francisco Health Plan
53. San Francisco Health Service System
54. San Francisco Police Department - Legal Division
55. San Francisco Public Defender's Office
56. SF Adult Probation Department
57. SF Child Care Planning & Advisory Council
58. SF HSA/ Disability and Aging Services
59. SF Rent Board (RNT)
60. SF Youth Commission
61. SFMTA
62. Sheriff's Department Oversight Board
63. SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee
64. Successor Agency Commission (aka Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure), Oversight Board to the Successor Agency
65. Treasure Island Development Authority
66. Urban Forestry Council
67. Veterans Affairs Commission
68. War Memorial

City Bodies included in NextRequest Summary Report that did not complete the survey

1. Arts Commission
2. Department of Technology
3. Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing

SOTF 2024 Annual Report

4. Human Rights Commission
5. Mayor's Office on Disability
6. Port of San Francisco
7. Department of Sanitation and Streets
8. Treasurer & Tax Collector.
9. Fire Department
10. Department of Public Health
11. Public Utilities Commission

Appendix C: Hearings Held in 2024

File #	SOTF Hearings	EOTC Hearing	Complaint Committee Hearing	Compliance & Amendments Hearing	Total SOTF + Committee Hearings
20008	1		1		2
22010	3		1		4
22115	1		1		2
22116	1		1		2
22034	1		1		2
22047	1		1		2
23016	1		1		2
23098	1				1
21128	3			1	4
21140	1		1		2
22134	1		1		2
22135	1		1		2
23013C	2		1		3
23013D	1		1		2
21125	1	1			2
22129	1	1			2
24003	1		1		2
22126	1		1		2
23010	1		1		2
23018	1			1	2
23020	1	1			2
23036	1	1			2
23024	1		1		2
23033	1			1	2
22027	2		1	1	4
22028	2		1	1	4
23034	1		1		2
22060	1	1			2
22099	1	1			2
23023	1		1		2
23013E	1		1		2
23007	1		1		2
23030	1			1	2
23050	1		1		2

SOTF 2024 Annual Report

23048	2		1		3
23060	1	1			2
24001	1		1		2
24005	1		1		2
24013	1		1		2
24014	1		1		2
24016	1		1		2
24017	1		1		2
23093	1		1		2
23053	1		1		2
23086	1			1	2
23079	1		1		2
23068	1		1		2
24020	1	1			2
24025	1	1			2
24028	1		1		2
23067	2		1		3
23081	1		1		2
23095	1		1		2
23099	2		1		3
23013A	1		1		2
24044	1		1		2
24045	1		1		2
24047	1		1		2
23058	1		1		2
24009	1		1		2
23090	1		1		2
23100	1		1		2
24002	1		1		2
24043	1		1		2
24048	1		1		2
21145	1		1		2
24021	2	1			3
24037	1		1		2
24041	1		1		2
24042	1		1		2
24054	1		1		2
23096			1		1
24053	1		1		2
Total	83	10	58	6	157

Appendix D: Average Days Between Petitions and Scheduled Hearing 2024

File #	Complaint Filed	Regular Hearing	Consent Agenda	Average Days to Hearing
20008	1/14/20	1/3/2024 (continued); 2/7/24		1450
22010	2/14/22			
22115	10/7/22	1/3/24		453
22116	10/10/22	1/3/24		450
22034	4/4/22	1/3/24		639
22047	4/26/22	1/3/24		618
23016	2/6/23		2/7/24	366
23098	11/27/23	2/7/24		72
21128	9/29/21			
21140	10/12/21	2/7/24		848
22134	11/7/22	2/7/24		457
22135	11/7/22	2/7/24		457
23013C	1/28/23	2/7/24		
23013D	2/13/23	2/7/24		359
21125	9/20/21		3/6/24	898
22129	11/4/22		3/6/24	488
24003	1/19/24		3/6/24	47
22126	10/27/22	3/6/24		496
23010	1/20/23	3/6/24		411
23018	2/6/23	3/6/24		394
23020	3/8/23	3/6/24		364
23036	3/22/23	3/6/24		350
23024	3/1/23	3/6/24		371
23033	3/13/23	3/6/24		359
22027	3/8/22			
22028	3/8/22			
23034	3/20/23	4/3/24		380
22060	5/10/22	4/3/24		694
22099	9/1/22	4/3/24		580
23023	3/6/23	4/3/24		394
23013E	1/28/23	4/3/24		431
23007	1/19/23	5/1/24		468
23030	3/20/23	5/1/2024 (continued); 6/5/24		408
23050	4/27/23	5/1/24		370
23048	4/19/23	5/1/24		

SOTF 2024 Annual Report

23060	6/27/23	5/1/24	309
24001	1/6/24	6/5/24	151
24005	1/21/24	6/5/24	136
24013	3/4/24	6/5/24	93
24014	3/1/24	6/5/24	96
24016	3/20/24	6/5/24	77
24017	3/20/24	6/5/24	77
23093	11/3/23	6/5/24	215
23053	5/17/23	6/5/24	385
23086	9/20/23	6/5/2024 (continued); 8/7/24	259
23079	8/30/23	6/5/24	280
23068	10/5/23	8/7/24	307
24020	4/16/24	8/7/24	113
24025	5/8/24	8/7/24	92
24028	5/10/24	8/7/24	90
23067	8/14/23	8/7/24	359
23081	9/1/23	8/7/24	341
23095	11/14/23	8/7/24	267
23099	12/7/23	8/7/24	244
23013A	1/28/23	8/7/24	557
24044	7/2/24	9/4/24	64
24045	7/11/24	9/4/24	55
24047	7/25/24	9/4/24	41
23058	6/1/23	9/4/24	461
24009	1/25/24	9/4/24	223
23090	10/31/23	9/4/24	309
23100	12/26/23	9/4/24	253
24002	1/19/24	9/4/24	229
24043	7/11/24	10/2/24	83
24048	8/2/24	10/2/24	61
21145	10/26/21	10/2/24	1072
24021	4/22/24	10/2/24	163
24037	6/21/24	10/2/24	103
24041	7/8/24	10/2/24	86
24042	7/2/24	10/2/24	92
24054	9/20/24	11/19/24	60
23096	11/16/23	11/19/2024 (continued)	369
24053	9/9/24	11/19/24	71
			333

Appendix E: 2024 Task Force Members

Matthew Yankee, Chair
Laura Stein, Vice-Chair
Dean Schmidt
Lila LaHood
Ankita Mukhopadhyay Kumar
Maxine Anderson
Saul Sugarman
Chris Hyland
David Pilpel
Bruce Wolfe
Thuan Thao Hill